

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN ... JOURNAL ...

*A Presbyterian monthly magazine devoted to the
statement, defense and propagation of the
Gospel, the faith which was once for
all delivered unto the saints.*

Volume I — Number 1

MAY 1942

Yearly Subscription \$1.00

OUR SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN BANNERS

By Rev. William Childs Robinson, D.D.

THE TRIUMPH OF INCLUSIVISM

By Rev. E. Edwin Paulson, S.T.M.

CHRIST'S WORDS ON WAR AND PEACE

By Rev. Robert F. Campbell, D.D.

THE CHURCH AND WAR

By General Douglas MacArthur

WHY GO ON?

By Rev. Samuel McPheeters Glasgow, D.D.

A UNITED CHURCH

By Rev. D. S. Gage, D.D.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

By Rev. Daniel Iverson, D.D.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL

PUBLISHED BY THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL COMPANY

Rev. Henry B. Dendy, D.D., Editor — Weaverville, N. C.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Rev. Samuel McP. Glasgow, D.D.
Rev. Robert F. Gribble, D.D.

Rev. Edward Mack, D.D.
Rev. Cecil H. Lang, D.D.

Rev. Wm. Childs Robinson D.D.
Rev. John M. Wells, D.D.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. Charles C. Dickinson, Chairman
Rev. Samuel McP. Glasgow, D.D.
Mr. S. Donald Fortson
Rev. R. E. Hough, D.D.

Rev. Henry B. Dendy, D.D.
Rev. T. A. Painter, D.D.

Rev. John R. Richardson, D.D.
Rev. Charlton Hutton
Mr. T. S. McPheeters
Dr. L. Nelson Bell, Sec'y-Treas.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Benjamin Clayton
Rev. Wilbur Cousar, D.D.
Rev. John Davis
Rev. Graham Gilmer, D.D.
Mr. Tom Glasgow
Rev. J. D. Henderson, D.D.
Rev. Daniel Iverson, D.D.

Rev. John W. Carpenter, D.D.
Rev. John Scott Johnson, D.D.
Rev. Wil R. Johnson, D.D.
Rev. Robert King, D.D.
Rev. Joseph Mack
Rev. A. R. McQueen, D.D.

Dr. S. B. McPheeters
Judge C. Ellis Ott
Rev. Walter Somerville
Major Calvin Wells
Rev. R. A. White, D.D.
Rev. Twyman Williams, D.D.
Rev. Edgar Woods

APPLICATION FOR ENTRY AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER IS PENDING

EDITORIAL

WHY?

Why THE JOURNAL at this time?

This question has been asked and it justifies a specific reply. The interesting thing, however, is that it has been asked by only a few of the hundreds who have sent in subscriptions. To many, the answer is obvious, and their response has been enthusiastic.

However, there must be clear justification for the time, effort and financial outlay involved in such an undertaking, and we hope now, and in the coming months, to show that such justification exists.

THE JOURNAL has been contemplated for a long time. Six years ago a meeting was held to discuss its launching. Events of the past twelve months have convinced us that this is a necessary task which can no longer be delayed. This movement is therefore not the result of hasty action; it comes as the result of concerted prayer, thought, and work.

The civilization of which we are a part is perched precariously on the edge of an abyss. This is obvious to all, whether in or outside of the Church. The tragedy is that, in part, the Christian Church is to blame.

It is to blame in so far as it has left its God-given task of preaching the Gospel of salvation from sin through the Lord Jesus Christ.

It is to blame in so far as it has turned from faith in, and the preaching of, the Bible as truly and wholly the Word of God, condoning preach-

ing and teaching calculated to question or destroy this precious faith.

It is to blame where it has substituted for the Gospel of redemption a programme of social reform.

It is to blame to the extent to which it has stepped out of its spiritual role, to meddle, as the Church, in political and economic matters and affairs of State.

It is to blame where, as has so often been the case, the Gospel message has been diluted and made pleasant to the taste of unregenerate man; denying the fact of, and the heinousness of sin, and the certain doom of the unrepentant sinner.

But, despite these failures of the Church, a return to a faithful ministry of the Truth can yet, by the power of the Holy Spirit, provide the spiritual and moral stamina which is essential for world stabilization. To this spiritual awakening and revival THE JOURNAL is dedicated.

The Rev. Samuel M. Shoemaker, rector of Calvary Episcopal Church, New York City, for many years a prominent leader in the Oxford Group Movement, in turning from that "periphery-religion" and preaching a manifesto against the "Golden Rule religion of humanism," calling his people back to the old Gospel, had this to say in his now famous sermon of last October 19:

"I have a deep and growing conviction that what passes among us in these days, for Christianity is very thin stuff, very remote from the original to which we are always going back in our minds, to adjust our compasses. I believe that the

whole modernistic trend in religion, instead of getting us free of the accumulated encumbrances of generations and bringing us back face to face with the simple realities of Christ, is another encumbrance, another false steer, another path away from reality instead of a path toward it. Some of us have never caught original Christianity by the hem. For original Christianity began with the announcement of something that God had done, something that God had given. It was wholly supernatural, not so much in the sense of the miraculous accompaniments to it, but in the sense that it was itself a great miracle, because only God Himself could have created it. Original Christianity, true Christianity for all time, is not a matter of man reaching down to find man; not a matter of man trying to live up to a moral code which he believes pleasing to God, but of man responding with his whole nature to the mercy and kindness of God."

Our Southern Presbyterian Church has not escaped these tendencies to change the Gospel message to another gospel. We believe the great majority in our Church still love the story of God's redeeming love and power, want to preach it, want to hear it, and want to know it is being taught in our institutions. However, there are *symptoms* to prove that this attitude is not unanimous.

The underlying and fundamental issue is the integrity of the Scriptures. This integrity is an essential foundation of Christian faith and living. David says, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" Attacks on the Word of God, direct or veiled, because of their ultimate effect in destroying faith, are in effect attacks on the Lord Himself. Germany today is living proof of the devastating effect of destructive criticism. Faith cometh by hearing the Word of God, and this faith brings individual and national righteousness.

In taking this position we concede full latitude for difference of interpretation. For instance, men of equally deep piety and scholarship may differ on many interpretations: baptism, the return of the Lord, etc. *But*, we are unwilling to admit that a man has the right, in "interpreting" the *facts* of Scripture, to eliminate them from the realm of fact and place them in the category of fiction or error. This is not interpretation but presumption at its worst.

One of the symptoms of the underlying disease is misapprehension as to the mission of the Church. The Federal Council has caused confusion and resentment by constant meddling, in the name of the Church, in economic, political, social and racial matters, and in the affairs of State. There is incontrovertible evidence that prior to our entry into

the present war this organization used every available means to hamper the efforts of our Government to prepare for the conflict which seemed inevitable. Now that we are in the war, this same Council is already preparing the terms of peace which it proposes to foster. Little wonder that some turn from the Church in distress and even resentment.

The desire for union is, we believe, another symptom of the present misunderstanding of the mission of the Church. The union about which Christ prayed in John 17 was a union of kindred spirits. Union on any other basis is not union but mesalliance not sanctioned by God. To be specific, union with the Northern Church under existing conditions would not be union, it would be *absorption*, with our individual testimony as a Church gone, with our agencies disrupted, with the control of our Church destiny taken from our hands, and, in the long run, certain grievous heartache and disunity. The proper sequence, outlined by James, is still the right sequence, "First pure, then peaceable."

THE JOURNAL knows that a critical spirit cannot win those who take the opposite position. But it does believe that a clear presentation of issues involved can be used, by God's blessing and help, to keep our Church true to, not only her historical position, but also to the path God wants us to walk today. Let us preach the Gospel in season and out, knowing that it is still the power of God unto salvation to all who believe.

Brethren, pray for us. Help us maintain this goal and this spirit by sending us articles or short incidents calculated to increase our love for our Lord and His Word, and our effectiveness in serving Him.

—L.N.B.

Hath God Spoken? If So, Who Should Interpret His Word, Himself Or Satan?

"Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" These words constitute the first step in the temptation of Satan to our first parents which resulted in their sin and fall and brought all mankind into an estate of sin and misery. Let us notice that he does not begin with a direct frontal attack on God's spoken Word. He leaves that for the next logical step. First he would sow the seed of doubt, "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" One can see the cynical sneer on his face and hear the insinuating intonation of his voice as his diabolical spirit, coming in the guise of one with superior knowledge and a would-be friend,

says: "O, yes? Did he *really* tell you a thing like *that*?" Receiving a positive answer from Eve that God had thus spoken, he then openly accuses God of lying and of seeking thereby to withhold something good from his children, something that they had every right to possess and which would cause their eyes to be opened and they would be like gods. This is Satan's basic principle of temptation today. It is still, "Hath God spoken," and "Did He *really* say *that*?" Or was not *this* rather what He meant? Let *us* not be deceived, when he thus speaks, for whether he comes as a man in the street; as a voice from the pew or even from the pulpit; yea, even though he may come in the guise of a learned college or university or even seminary professor, it is the voice of Satan and should be so recognized. His intentions are the same as of old, to wreck that which is dear to the heart of God. His agents may be doing his service unwittingly. This makes them doubly dangerous. As The Southern Presbyterian Journal begins its ministry to our Lord and to His Church we want to go on record as a journal devoted to the statement, defense and propagation of the Gospel, the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.

We are seeking constructive action to safeguard and foster and propagate the old Gospel of redemption through the Saviour. We want to aid in the pressing national problems of our day through emphasis on the Bible as truly the inspired word of God, worthy of the trust and love of all. We believe this stand can be taken in humility and in love and that it will commend itself to many.

We believe that the overwhelming majority of our ministers are sound in the faith, but we also feel that in the past they have not had a rallying ground, a place to look for leadership, or a medium through which they might find expression of common views.

We believe also that such a paper will commend itself to the membership of our Church who, in the large, love the old Gospel and want to hear it preached and know that it is being taught in our institutions.

We also feel that we need a more vigorous presentation of evangelistic methods, stories of God's grace in souls won for Him, and incidents calculated to strengthen our faith and love and encourage us to renewed efforts to serve our Lord.

—H.B.D.

In addition to our fine group of Contributing Editors we have a large Advisory Committee, both of which are listed elsewhere in this issue. However, we want every reader to help us make this Journal what it ought to be for the glory of God and the furtherance of His work. We invite your comments and constructive criticisms. We realize our own human limitations and handicaps, but we are praying that God may so guide and direct us that His will may be done in our lives. May we ask that you join us in the prayer that The Journal may be a great blessing to many?

In addition to our regular Department on Evangelism and Personal Work, we want to carry regularly suggestions on the other departments of our Church Program, particularly along the lines of Sunday School and Young People's Work.

At present it is not our plan to carry advertising or syndicated articles, as ours is to be only a monthly journal and our space is so definitely limited.

All our executive committees are going to the General Assembly this year with excellent reports. We have received copies of most of these, as well as other reports going up from the special ad-interim committees. We commend these reports to the prayerful and careful consideration of the Church, but lack of space forbids our printing or further commenting thereon at this time.

We will carry a Book Review Section, under the direction of Rev. John R. Richardson, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, La.

We have received an excellent little booklet of Questions on the Bible, of which Rev. Frank B. Estes, of Orangeburg, S. C., is the Author. These questions appeared in serial form in The Christian Observer and many pastors are finding it very helpful in Sunday School Classes and with their Young People. The price is 25 cents and it can be secured from the Author.

—H.B.D.

Our Southern Presbyterian Banners

BY REV. WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON, D.D.

"In the Name of our God we will set up our banners." Ps. 20:5.

"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear Thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth". Ps. 60:4.

When Scottish Presbyterianism was threatened by Stuart Totalitarianism the leaders of the Church renewed the Covenant signing that hallowed document with blood drawn from their own veins. Recalling General Leslie from his service under Gustavus Adolphus, they marshalled an army to maintain their covenanted faith. As the blue stocking host gathered flying before each captain's tent was a blue banner with this inscription, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant".

When Hampden C. Dubose returned from the Confederate War he found that the fathers had fallen asleep, that the generation of young men who had escaped the sword had missed a college education, that the theological seminaries were closed that the colleges had lost their endowments, that few were left to lead in public prayer and that the songs of Zion were being sung by mourning women. But through the sorrows of war and the humiliation of Reconstruction, our Church was rich in God. The fathers had lifted their banners in God and the living God in whom they trusted did not forsake them.

In another hour of need, we are seeking to wave the banners which our heroic fathers lifted in the Name of God. Under these banners there have come to our people blessing and increase, power and strength. The God of our fathers is equally potent to-day. He is the all-sufficient God, all-sufficient for Himself and all-sufficient for His people. May His Spirit give us strength to keep these banners waving from every Southern Presbyterian Bethel, every place in which He hath caused His Name to dwell: the blue banner of covenanted loyalty to Christ as the only King in Zion, the only Head of His body the Church; the banner of His holy Word; the banner of the Westminster Standards which testify to His saving grace and sovereign glory; the banner of missions as the mission of the Church.

I. The Redeemer is the only King of Zion, the only Head over His Body the Church. Alexander Henderson used Psalm 110:1 to set forth the truth that God had placed Christ at His own right

hand to govern his Church. The Church is subject to Christ alone not to Caesar. As B. M. Palmer declared at Augusta in 1861, God hath given Christ to be Head over all things to His body the Church. I owe allegiance as a citizen to the country and as a believer to the Church. God has established two governments—Church and State—but neither of these is subject to the other, while I am subject to both and God is over both.

The Church recognizes the Headship of Christ when she accepts the system of doctrine, government, discipline and worship which He has given her in His Word and obeys His command to add nothing thereto (B.C.O. 10). Likewise when she confines her activities to the functions He has commissioned her to perform. God has not given to the Church the police functions of the magistrate, but the preaching of His Word, the enforcement of His law, the gathering and perfecting of His saints. The Headship of Christ is recognized in the acceptance of the sufficiency of the written Word, the architectonic principle of the Scottish Covenants. The Church is God's servant proclaiming His revealed will, not His confidential adviser presuming to supplement that Word in either worship, discipline or doctrine. The Headship of Christ is recognized in trying to govern the Church according to the pattern shown in the Mount of Scripture.

Presbyterianism is a system of church government by courts composed of elders (the presbyters of Scripture) called of God through the suffrage of His people. These courts are organized to represent the unity of the Church and to maintain the authority of Christ speaking in His Word. The Presbyterian officers receive their call, their authority, their gifts from Christ (Eph. 4).

II. The Bible is the Word of God written, the sceptre of the King, the mouth of the Lord, the rule of faith, life and worship. The Fathers of the Southern Presbyterian Church maintained the infallible truth and Divine authority of the Holy Scripture in distinction from those critical views which deny that the Bible is what it professes to be and what our Lord Jesus Christ declares it to be. Our Church has had its part in making the South the Bible belt. In His infinite wisdom God has given this Book to be a lamp unto our feet and where its light illumines the way the freedoms of mankind flourish.

The very architecture of our Presbyterian

Churches has testified that we have sought to be the Church of the Word. According to the Reformed Faith, the New Testament altar is in heaven where the great High Priest ministers, and that from this heavenly fount the blessings of the covenant of grace are dispensed by means of the pulpit where the Word is preached and the Table where the Lord's Supper is spread.

The Holy Spirit is the author of saving Faith in Christ and in working faith He uses the instrument of His own forging, namely, the Word He hath inspired. It pleases God by the foolishness of preaching to save, so that faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of Christ. Thus, "faith has a perpetual relation to the Word, and can no more be separated from it than the rays from the sun whence they proceed."

III. As the Apostle repeatedly called his readers to observe the pattern of doctrine delivered to them (Rom. 6:17; II Tim. 1:12) so our fathers at their First General Assembly adopted the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as their confession of the living God. Our standards recognize a God who is infinite in majesty and eternal in love, a sovereign Father and a fatherly Sovereign. They echo the Saviour's "Father, Lord of heaven and earth." The consistent Calvinism of these standards is a vision of God in His majesty, of the King in His beauty and a consequent sense of our utter dependence upon Him. We depend upon God for truth and in the obedience of faith receive what He has revealed in His Word. We depend upon God for life and history as we state in the doctrines of foreordination, creation and providence. We depend upon God for religion, not seeking to construct human religious masterpieces, but worshipping the God who has graciously revealed Himself to Christian faith. Justification by faith alone means that we depend wholly upon the work of Christ for acceptance with God, that He is our Righteousness and that the Holy Spirit hath enabled us to receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation.

Our Confession sees God, the Father, first in creation, God, the Son, first in Redemption, and God, the Spirit, first in regeneration and seeks to give God all the glory of the whole saving process. In words that future events have proven prophetic Professor A. Lecerf of the theological faculty of the University of Paris brought this testimony from a Lutheran colleague to the Edinburgh Calvinistic Congress: "Our people need doctrine, a strong doctrine. I think God has something in store for His Church, something very dreadful. And because God knows that His Church needs a back-

bone, He is bringing her back to Calvinism which is the backbone of Christianity."

IV. In immediate connection with the Headship of Christ, our first General Assembly wrote upon our banner the Great Commission. Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature is the great end of our Church's organization and obedience to it is the indispensable condition of our Lord's promised blessing. Missions is the one grand comprehensive object a proper conception of whose vast magnitude and grandeur is the only thing which in connection with the love of Christ can ever sufficiently arouse the Church's energies and develop her resources, so as to cause her to carry on with the vigor and efficiency which true loyalty to her Lord demand, those other agencies necessary to her internal growth and efficiency. The Southern Presbyterian Church is a missionary society and every member is a member for life of that society.

God has so blessed this banner lifted first by a Church hemmed in by hostile armies that to-day we have more members on the foreign field than we had when we started in the home field. And though many of our missionaries have had to leave under the pressure of Japanese conquest, the seed has been sown and the harvest is certain. It is interesting to notice that our three ministers who have done the most noteworthy social service have been men who most emphatically maintained that missions was the mission of the Church. While they were loyally preaching the Gospel in season and out of season, God gave to Hampden C. Dubose the added privilege of sharing largely in the suppression of the opium traffic, to J. Leighton Wilson to contribute the decisive article which stopped the African slave trade, and to B. M. Palmer to deliver the eloquent civic address which crushed the Louisiana lottery. As these fathers of the Southern Presbyterian Church administered in the Church the task which the Founder laid upon the Church, God gave them the added privilege of accomplishing noteworthy things as citizens. They did not confuse the two distinct spheres in which men ought to serve the one God.

As my distinguished predecessor Dr. R. C. Reed well said, the Church is an institution that did not originate in the will of man and that does not exist to further ends determined by the will and wisdom of men. "Its mission is to promote the glory of God and the salvation of men from the curse of the law." "The Church is an organization of which Christ is the Head and King, it can speak only what He has commissioned it to speak."

May the God of all grace give our feeble hands strength to hold aloft the mighty banners which the Fathers of the Southern Presbyterian Church lifted in the Name of our God!

The Triumph of Inclusivism

BY REV. E. EDWIN PAULSON, S.T.M.

This significant article by Mr. Paulson is a reprint of the article published in CHRISTIANITY TODAY (Fall Number 1941). It has been included in this issue because of the belief that it "gives in calm and dispassionate words the story of the declension in faith of a sister Presbyterian Church" and that it indicates "a current trend" in other Presbyterian churches.

For more than a quarter of a century a fierce struggle raged within the Presbyterian Church. Unfortunately the issues involved in this conflict have not yet been understood by the rank and file of either the ministers or laymen in our Church. As in the case of political conflicts the real issues have been largely obscured behind personalities so that attempts have been persistently made to prove that this controversy was due to the presence in the Presbyterian Church of a narrow-minded and intolerant group of men. Instead of examining critically the ideological basis for this difference, it was charged that members of the protesting groups were suffering from temperamental idiosyncrasies, introversion and other personality maladjustments. Today many of these men are either dead or they have left our Church.

Some members of the Presbyterian Church will rejoice because these so-called trouble-makers have been expelled. They were regarded by certain individuals as diseased limbs for which there was no cure but amputation. However every serious student of current church history knows that the issues involved in this controversy are yet to be settled. No real problem has ever been solved by clearing the church of one group of "protestants." This condition of "all quiet on the theological front" is certainly not an indication that all is well within the Presbyterian Church. It is in fact an ominous sign, for it indicates that many men who know the issues involved in this controversy have been willing to subscribe to a policy of appeasement, which may or may not insure some kind of ignominious "peace in our time."

For the purpose of clarity it will be necessary to review the issues involved in this conflict and to note how one form of policy triumphed over another. The basic issue may be stated in two words: Exclusivism vs. Inclusivism. On one side were arrayed those who understood Christianity to be a religion which in its very nature is and must continue to be an exclusive one; on the other side were grouped those who felt there was room in the Church for all shades and varieties of opinion with respect to the Christian faith. The question was not whether one belonged to the Old or New School of Calvinism, although some believe that the conflict had its beginning in that struggle. It was rather

a struggle between those who endorsed the five points of faith, set forth by the Assembly of 1923, as the absolute minimum doctrinal basis for evangelical Christianity, and those who by either adhering to or by tolerating the tenets of the Auburn Affirmation, showed that they refused to be bound by any objective standards of faith. We must remember that the Church was tending to become an inclusive one long before the advent into positions of prominence of the men who struggle heroically to prevent further lowering of the doctrinal standards of the Church. Dr. J. Gresham Machen used to say that he was not the cause of the struggle in the Church, but that he was merely an occasion. While he was often referred to as a trouble-maker, this was just as unfair as it was for Ahab to call Elijah the troubler of Israel. Just as Ahab and his associates, who forsook the faith of their fathers, were the real troublemakers of Israel, the proponents of a broad inclusivism were and are the real trouble-makers in the Presbyterian Church.

As we look back on these past few years, it becomes increasingly evident that Inclusivism has triumphed even beyond the fondest hopes and expectations of its advocates. This victory for the proponents of Inclusivism has resulted, among other things, in the expulsion or voluntary exodus from our Church of many conscientious men and women who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Such fearless defenders of historic Christianity have been objects of scorn and derision, but history must honor them as those who dared to place principles in precedence to policy, valuing the praise of God above the praise of men.

Many ministers remained within the Church because they felt that they could not desert thousands of true believers who did not, and perhaps could not, grasp the full significance of the subtleties of theological controversy. Others of us have not seen our way clear to take a stand that would divide congregations already too weak to carry on work effectively. Perhaps still others have been unwilling to pay the full price which adherence to convictions would have demanded of them. Many valid reasons can be given for remaining within the church: not one can be adduced, however, in favor of cowardly silence when conditions within the Presbyterian

Church demand both vigorous protest and corrective action. The sad thing is not that we have remained within a Church which has sinned grievously, but that we have been content to remain silent and have been willing to subscribe to a policy of appeasement which in the end must inevitably rob us of strength of character and any distinctive Christian testimony.

As the dangers of "Inclusivism" have become increasingly apparent, the present writer has waited patiently but in vain for strong protests and warnings from ministers of reputation and unimpeachable standing in our Church. Voices have been strangely silent that promised years ago to proclaim with unusual brilliancy and clarity the whole counsel of God. It is because of this absence of protest from other and far more qualified sources that the present writer feels impelled to set down his own convictions in utter frankness. There is certainly grave cause for disquiet in the situation which confronts us today, either as ministers or as laymen. Our Church, which in the past has been a creedal one glorying in its virile and logical theology, has granted the highest honors and most important offices to several men who signed the infamous Auburn Affirmation, a document which virtually nullifies all objective standards of faith. It would be interesting, if it were not so sad and pathetic, to note that this happened at the May General Assembly but that it was not until September that an editorial dealing with this vexing subject finally appeared in the "conservative" weekly of our Church. In other words a battle that should have begun in May appeared in the form of a lame skirmish in September.

It is not the purpose of the present writer to pass judgment upon the status of our Church, whether it is officially apostate, as some claim, or whether it has remained essentially sound, as others think. The objective of this article is simply to show a few of the practical problems with which a conscientious pastor is confronted in a denomination which has become doctrinally inclusive. It is true that no one in our denomination is in any direct way hindered in preaching the Gospel. Because this is so, some will say, "What is so important about all this? There are many outstanding preachers of the Gospel left in our Church. Why are you not satisfied to do as they are doing?" To such rationalizations one might be tempted to give a variety of answers. Conservative Calvinists and premillennial dispensationalists are unquestionably allowed free course in preaching the Gospel in our Church: equal privileges are afforded those who do not proclaim the vicarious atonement but who preach pleasant-sounding moral essays and a form of sentimental idealism. Does not this appear to be an almost ideal situation? "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in

unity!" Truly a denomination which has espoused a policy of doctrinal latitudinarianism presents an ideal situation to individuals who are Churchmen first and theologians secondly. But to men who are intellectually honest and who are troubled with certain conscientious scruples, it spells a different story. Such men know that it would be next to impossible today to convict an individual in our church courts for preaching and teaching heretical doctrines. A man who would dare to institute charges against another minister on doctrinal grounds would only be committing ecclesiastical suicide. There remains but one thing that might be classified as heresy, and that is a failure to support the boards, agencies and institutions of our denomination. Men who have openly refused to support denominational agencies have suffered excommunication. Others who have been critical of the boards and agencies or who have displayed too little enthusiasm for their support have usually been relegated to positions of comparative oblivion. The sinister shadow of totalitarianism surely lurks in such practices, proving that when men value anything above utter and implicit obedience to the Word of God, they gain not the freedom they anticipate but a character-deadening, soul-destroying bondage.

In an inclusive Church faithful pastors frequently find themselves in strange predicaments. Let us suppose that such a pastor has taught his people over a period of years to love the Bible and all its essential doctrines. A family in his parish finds it necessary to move to another place, and so they come to ask him for his recommendation of a church in the new community. This pastor is intensely interested in the spiritual well-being of each member of his family: he is also thoroughly acquainted with the preaching and program of the Presbyterian Church in the city to which they are going, and knows, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that a positive presentation of the Gospel is not now being given there. As a faithful shepherd, he is therefore constrained to advise his own people to attend the church of another denomination. Of course a pastor who gives his people such counsel will be regarded by some as being deliberately disloyal to his denomination. But this is not true. Because he is deeply concerned about their continued spiritual growth, he must place loyalty to the Word of God far above allegiance to his own denomination.

Young people frequently come to their pastor to discuss college plans and to obtain his judgment concerning various institutions. In one instance in the present writer's pastoral experience two young people were sent on his recommendation to a Presbyterian college. These young people had received a thorough grounding in the Christian faith and went to college far better fortified than the ma-

jority of youth. It was not long before several members of the college faculty called in question the teachings these two boys had received in their own church. While their pastor might conceivably have been wrong in his teaching, such a claim would actually have constituted an indictment of the faculty of the leading Seminary of the Presbyterian Church where the pastor received his training. One thing is certain: either the faculty of the seminary or the faculty of the college was guilty of teaching error. They could not both be right. When the pastor made a sincere and gracious effort to call the attention of the Church to this condition, he was considered to be overly critical of his brethren in the ministry. He was also intimidated by the president of the college. Only the grace of God can prevent a man from becoming somewhat bitter when he sees no help forthcoming from those who must realize how momentous the issues involved really are. Later, when other young people came and sought advice, they were recommended to a college of another denomination where an intelligent faith in the Bible as the Word of God would not be undermined.

Conscientious Bible-believing pastors are faced with the same perplexing problem when questions arise concerning Summer Bible conferences for young people. For some reason difficult to understand, our denominational conferences are too often directed by those who hesitate to sound a positive note as to the need of personal regeneration. To criticisms raised on this score, the retort commonly is that the purpose of such conferences is not to conduct evangelistic services but to train young Christians for service in the church. On the surface this might appear to be a valid argument, but when a pastor discovers the colorless, not to say negative, quality of the teaching offered, he must conclude that his young people might better stay at home or be sent to some interdenominational conference where constructive evangelical teachings will be offered. Yet such a pastor must pay dearly for his convictions, even being accused of unfaithfulness to the Church which ordained him. By some he may be referred to as queer, critical, censorious, uncooperative and actively disloyal. As a matter of fact nothing could be further from the truth. A minister who takes such a stand is merely exercising discernment and showing real loyalty to the constitution of the Church and to his holy ordination vows. To say that such a man is disloyal is equivalent to saying that a man who is loyal to the constitution of the land is unpatriotic and disloyal because he cannot subscribe to the tenets and practices of a certain party that happens to be in power.

Another vexing problem with which a Bible-believing pastor is faced is the matter of supporting the agencies of his denomination. There can be no question but that a large percentage of the mis-

sionaries of the Presbyterian Church, both of the past and the present, have been and are men and women of unusual ability, devotion to duty, and high spiritual purpose. The splendid record of Presbyterian foreign missionary endeavor is convincing proof of this. One would think, therefore, that all pastors could present the cause of foreign missions without any deadening inhibitions. However a careful study of the facts concerning the present foreign missionary enterprises of our Church soon reveals that even this sacred area of Christian endeavor has not entirely escaped the blight of Inclusivism. Reports from our own missionaries have shown us that union movements have led to dangerous compromise. One can therefore no longer be assured that money given to the Board of Foreign Missions will all be used for the perpetuation of evangelical Christianity. Exactly the same situation prevails with respect to church endeavors here at home. All these facts must of necessity serve to dampen a minister's ardor for promoting the cause of denominational agencies and institutions. He finds himself in the anomalous situation, where his very loyalty to the theology and constitution of his own Presbyterian Church clashes with his allegiance to its present policies and practices. All the foregoing practical problems must be faced by conscientious Bible believing pastors who are serving within a denomination in which doctrinal inclusivism holds sway. If they hold true to their convictions they will be misunderstood and maligned and their advancement blocked by influential ecclesiastical politicians.

During recent months the present writer has served as a Chaplain in two Army camps. Such work would seem to afford an avenue of escape from those troublesome correlates of doctrinal inclusivism which must be daily faced in the pastorate. But this has proved clearly not to be the case. Such an Army experience only serves to furnish further evidence of the havoc caused by the operation of the policy of Inclusivism in our Church. This writer is forced to record the fact that the majority of the Presbyterian Chaplains whom he has met are not men who preach the faith once delivered unto the saints. Some of them have openly ridiculed the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement. The result has been that, when joint services are conducted at a Post, men hear a strong Gospel message one Sunday and on the next they are forced to listen to a mild moralistic discourse. It is with sincerest regret and sorrow of heart that the present writer feels impelled to testify against men who are otherwise his friends. The issue so far outweighs personalities, however, that to keep silent is to give assent to such deplorable conditions within our Church.

One conclusion that may be safely drawn from all these foregoing illustrations is that many of the

Colleges and Seminaries, from which our ministers come, are not faithful to the Word of God and to the Reformed Faith. Any minister who possesses a modicum of theological ability and who has had a part in examining men who have recently graduated from our Seminaries must acknowledge that the evidence indisputably supports such a generalization. Do we not have the right to expect our seminaries to instruct prospective ministers as to the true nature of the Church? The Scriptures give ample warning as to the dangers of doctrinal laxity. The Apostle who wrote 1 Cor.: 13 also wrote Gal. 1:6-9 and Phil. 3:18. It was John, who has been referred to as the Apostle of Love, who in his Third Epistle wrote "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed: for he that biddeth him God-speed is a partaker of his evil deeds." These facts of Scripture are fully substantiated by the facts of Church History which prove decisively that whenever the Church has compromised on essential doctrines, it has in large measure lost its spiritual power and purity of life.

Advocates of a policy of appeasement have refused to face realistically the facts of Scripture and of history, showing by their very actions that they are either oblivious or indifferent to the grave dangers now besetting the Church. How vain it is to talk about church union and to seek for a larger denomination in the face of conditions bordering upon apostasy! The parable of the mustard seed furnishes a telling illustration. From a very modest beginning, like unto the mustard seed, our Church has become a great tree, harboring within its spreading branches a large variety of birds. These birds build their nests in its spreading limbs and apparently dominate the life of the tree. Thus today the Presbyterian Church, with the complete triumph of Inclusivism, harbors within its spreading branches groups and individuals who are out of

sympathy with or actively hostile to its historic position and creed and as such have therefore no organic connection with the source of its life. Like the fowl in the tree they partake of its shelter and are afforded protection by its abundant foliage. They feed upon the fruits and glory in the culture of our historic faith, but at the same time they are seeking to destroy the roots which are the source of its very life and strength. By a systematic spread of subversive teachings they are creating a spiritual dryrot that will in time leave the Church a hollow trunk, unable to withstand the force of totalitarian storms which are raising havoc with established institutions the world over.

Let us not forget that this problem is basically theological. The triumph of Inclusivism has made our great Church, which once gloried in the virile intellectual, moral and spiritual theology of the Hodges, Warfield, Wilson, Vos, Patton and Machen, the nurturer of a theological hodge-podge of Modernism, Buchmanism, Barthianism, subjectivism and sentimentalism. There was undoubtedly a prophetic note in the words of Doctor J. Gresham Machen when he told his students that it would be necessary for someone to appear who would rediscover the Gospel in the Presbyterian Church. At that time this must have seemed a very extreme statement, but experience and study have led us to believe that the beloved Doctor may not have been so far from the truth. Few thinking men will deny that the strength and vigor of Presbyterianism have resided in its thoroughly logical and Biblical theology. Modern exponents of Inclusivism either deny or disregard the truths which have made our Church great. People who attend Presbyterian churches today will in all probability learn little of Calvinistic theology, but worse than that they will often hear no truly evangelical preaching. The Lord of the Church alone knows what will be the final outcome of this lamentable condition.

Churchmen At Sea

Some three hundred and seventy-five delegates recently attended a conference at Ohio Wesleyan University under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches. Representing many different denominations the group sought to chart a course for the time at the end of the war. In general, the destination apparently in mind is one of internationalism, collectivism and materialism. We do not esteem the ecclesiastics in this conference very good guides. Representing groups which have been utterly unable to accomplish even the most simple kinds of unity, they seem hardly fitted to draw the blueprints for a world organization. They may swing the top crust of conference-going church-

men, but we doubt if they make much impression upon the rank and file of church-going Christians. We judge they look for a totalitarianism, only, of course, one to their own taste. A quoted statement describes "a duly constituted world government of delegated powers: an international legislative body, an international court with adequate jurisdiction, international administrative bodies with necessary powers and adequate international police forces, and provision for enforcing its world-wide economic authority." This sounds like pacifism gone belligerent; the Sermon on the Mount "with teeth in it," and the Gospel at the point of a gun, all managed by Protestant churchmen who have never been able to manage their own churches.

—The Presbyterian.

Christ's Words on War and Peace

BY ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, D.D.

"He beareth not the sword in vain." (Romans 13:4.)

"Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." (Matthew 26:52).

When Paul declares in the first of these texts, "He beareth not the sword in vain," he is speaking of the civil ruler. He says that God has armed the civil ruler with a sword, and that in the proper use of that sword he is a minister of God to punish evil and evil-doers and to protect men of goodwill, implying also the protection of the state, its citizens and their rights against those who are bent on injury or destruction.

Peter's Sword Against Caesar's

In the second text Christ is speaking of the sword, wielded not by the civil ruler, but by an individual who draws it in resistance to the civil authorities. This is clearly seen, if we consider carefully the circumstances under which the words were spoken.

Serious charges had been brought against Jesus, that He had declared He would destroy the temple and abrogate the law of Moses. And so an order had been issued by the chief priests and elders of the Jews for His arrest. Remember that the Jews and their land were at this time under the jurisdiction of the Roman Government. It was the policy of this government to allow the subjugated nations to make and administer their own laws under restrictions imposed by the Emperor. This was true of the Jews in the sphere of their ecclesiastical laws and religious customs. Under this provision, authority was granted to the chief priests and rulers to enforce their ecclesiastical laws through lightly armed men, known as the temple police. But all this under the close supervision of the Roman Government.

Hence it was that the temple police who were sent to arrest Jesus were accompanied, as John tells us in his Gospel, by a band of Roman soldiers under their captain. It appears, then, that the arrest was made under this double authority of Jerusalem and Rome. When they approached to arrest Jesus, the ardent and impulsive Peter drew his sword and cut off the ear of one of the servants of the high priest.

Then it was that Jesus rebuked Peter, saying, "Put up thy sword again into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

Now, in the light of these facts, what did Jesus mean by this rebuke? His meaning has been well

summarized by Bishop Porteus: "We are not to infer from this reproof that the use of the sword in self-defence is unlawful; but that the use of it against the magistrates and ministers of justice, which was the case in the present instance, is unlawful. It was meant also to check that propensity, which is but too strong and apparent in a large part of mankind to have recourse to the sword on all occasions, and more particularly to restrain private persons from avenging private injuries, which they should rather leave to the magistrate or to God. In all such cases, they who take the sword unjustly and rashly, will probably, as our Saviour here forewarns, perish with the sword; with the sword of their adversary, or of the magistrate."

Render Unto Caesar His Dues

In the light of this interpretation it is easy to see that the teachings of the Apostle Paul in the thirteenth chapter of Romans are in perfect accord with the teachings of Jesus.

Remember that when the question of obedience to the Roman Government in the paying of taxes was raised, Jesus had said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." In yielding to the arrest, even when there was no just cause for it, and in rebuking Peter for resisting, Jesus was rendering unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's, as He did in submitting to the judicial trials that followed.

If you or I should be accused of some breach of the law, of which we were entirely innocent, and officers of the law were sent by those in authority to arrest us, we should not be justified in resisting arrest. Our duty would be to render unto Caesar the submission due to Caesar, as Jesus taught and as Jesus did.

Paul tells us that we are to render submission, "not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience's sake"; that is, not only that we may escape the wrath of the civil government for our disobedience, but also that we may have a good conscience in the sight of God, who commands us to obey.

Misapplication Of The Lex Talionis

As Bishop Porteus says, Christ's reproof of Peter had two purposes: First, to warn us against resisting officers of the law. And, second, to warn us against taking the law into our own hands to avenge personal injuries by the use of force. This is a key to that saying of Christ's in the Sermon on the Mount: "Ye have heard that it was said

An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

This, as you know, is a quotation from the Law of Moses (Exodus 21:24), which Jesus said He had come not to destroy but to fulfill. It was addressed to the administrators of justice, and is a figurative way of saying that the penalty inflicted should be in proportion to the seriousness of the offence. It is a sound principle, and a wise provision against penalties that are either too light or too heavy.

But the Scribes and Pharisees taught that this law justified personal retaliation in kind for private injuries. They defended such a procedure by misapplying to private action what was given as a guide to the administration of public law.

This provision of the Mosaic Law still stands as a rule for the public administration of justice. It does not forbid but directs the use of force by the civil government in the infliction of penalties.

Exchanging Garments For Swords

It is remarkable how little Jesus had to say about war. He uses the word on only two occasions, and one of these in a parable or illustration (Luke 14:31-32.) The other occasion was in His prophetic address to His disciples a few days before His crucifixion, as recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in which He foretells "wars and rumors of wars."

Jesus was born and lived His entire life in a period of unprecedented peace, the Pax Romana, or Roman Peace, as it was called. It began with the victory of Octavius at Actium, 31 B.C., and lasted till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Titus, A.D. 70, a period of 101 years.

It was of this that Milton wrote in the Hymn of Christ's Nativity:

"No war, or battle's sound
Was heard the world around,
The idle spear and shield were high up-hung;
The hooked chariot stood
Unstained with hostile blood;
The trumpet spake not to the armed throng."

But Jesus warned His disciples that this era of peace was soon to be succeeded by a succession of "wars and rumors of wars." War implies weapons of war. And it was because of this that He said, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment (cloak) and buy one." That is, he will be called on by the government under which he lives and to which he owes allegiance to enlist and fight, and in order to get weapons with which to fight he will have to give up some things that seem as necessary as his outer garment or cloak. This was a

prediction as much as a prescription.

And do you not see that this is what we Americans are called on to do today? We have to exchange literally some of our garments of armament and munitions; silk stockings, for instance; then elastic belts, girdles and garters, raincoats with rubber, and overshoes; and tires must be rationed in order to save rubber for army trucks and tanks. A good many of our people will have to learn what their feet and legs were made for.

Church And State Divine Institutions

Another strange saying of Jesus that needs elucidation is found in His interview with Pilate, in which He said: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews" (to be put to death.) Remember that the Jews had accused Him to Pilate of fomenting sedition, of withholding tribute from Caesar, and of assuming the royal title, thus attempting to set up a kingdom in opposition to Rome. Pilate, therefore, sought an interview with Him, in which he asked, Art thou the king of the Jews? To which Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world." It is a spiritual kingdom, a kingdom based on truth, whose only weapon is the proclamation of the truth, as revealed in the Scriptures. But He goes on to declare, "If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews," implying that it would be their duty as loyal subjects to defend their King from capture and death.

In these words of Christ we are brought face to face with the subject of Church and State, their divine appointment, and their separate functions.

When Jesus spoke of His Kingdom as a Spiritual Kingdom, He had in mind the Church as the visible representative of that Kingdom on earth.

When He spoke of the kingdoms of this world, He had in mind the civil government, the State, whose authority in its own sphere He had already recognized, as we have seen.

The failure to grasp Christ's recognition of the two institutions, the Church and the State, and their separate spheres, functions and weapons, is responsible for much of the confused thinking in regard to the place of war, under God's providential government, in His plan and purpose for the world, and in regard to the Christian's duty in case the government under which he lives goes to war.

The Church and the State are both divinely appointed institutions under which men are to live.

The State has been ordained by God, as Creator and Moral Governor of the world, for man as a

social being in contact with and in relation to other men.

The Church is an institution of God considered as the Saviour and Restorer of mankind. It deals with man as a sinner, and its function is to make known to sinful men the will of God for their salvation.

God has put into the hands of each of these institutions a weapon. To the State He has given a sword, which is not to be borne in vain, but is to be used for the ends of social justice, and for the defence of the State's existence and the protection of its people.

To the Church He has given as its weapon, the good news of salvation from sin. The Church is to witness to Christ as the Saviour, and through the proclamation of the Gospel in the power of the Holy Spirit, to bring men to repentance of sin and faith in Christ.

This cannot be accomplished by force, because repentance and faith are in their very nature free and voluntary acts of the soul.

The State, whose weapon is a sword, has authority to declare war, but it is responsible to God for the use it makes of this authority.

War is "not to be entered into unadvisedly or lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." It is a solemn judicial act.

The Church, whose weapons are spiritual, has no right to declare or wage war. But it is one of the functions of the Church to declare, in accordance with God's Word, that the State is a divine institution, and that it is the obligation of all citizens to render due obedience and service to the State, both in peace and in war, as God has ordained. This is specially incumbent on citizens who are Christians, under the law of Christ, to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

We have seen how little Christ had to say about war. He had almost as little to say about peace, and in most instances He is speaking of inward peace, of mind and heart.

Not Peace But A Sword

But there is one saying of His that seems at first sight strange and perplexing, Matt. 10:34. "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." Strange words from the mouth of Him who is called "The Prince of Peace." What did He mean? The meaning seems to be that Christ came to introduce principles that would inevitably cause divisions and conflicts between man and man, and between nation and nation.

His ultimate purpose is peace; but an immediate purpose is conflict as the only road to

peace. He is first King of Righteousness, and after that also King of Peace.

Offences Must Needs Come

War is one of those offences, or occasions of stumbling, of which Christ said, "Offences must needs come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh."

Woe to those who by acts of aggression are responsible for armed conflict.

In a sinless world there would be no war, which is a dreadful manifestation of the corruption of human nature, and none of the nations at war can claim perfect freedom from responsibility. Our own nation has not always been free from guilt in its international policies and practices.

But if those whose general aim is the establishment of freedom and justice for all nations are to wait until they themselves have a perfect record of righteousness behind them, they will never act to carry out their aim. Counsels of perfection are well worthwhile as ideals toward which we are to strive. But when they are used to create the inferiority complex and to paralyze all effort toward the attainment of the perfection which they counsel, they become stumbling blocks to be kicked out of the path.

War calls forth some of the worst traits of human nature—hatred, bitterness, and revenge. But it need not be so. There is such a thing as righteous indignation without hate. "Be ye angry and sin not."

General Robert E. Lee was called "a foe without hate." Gamaliel Bradford says of him, he "breathed the spirit of lovingkindness into the intolerable hell of war."

War, on the other hand, calls forth some of the noblest traits of human nature—courage, loyalty, self-sacrifice, readiness to endure hardship and to die for something outside of self, bigger and greater than self. A soldier who has these traits is held up in the New Testament as a pattern for those who would be good soldiers of Jesus Christ.

Leland Stowe, a veteran war correspondent, tells us in his book, *No Other Road To Freedom*, that he has been asked what he personally got out of covering the war as a correspondent. His reply is: "I have had very many things which will be part of me for the rest of my days. But of them all nothing is richer and more heartwarming real than this: I have had the inestimable privilege of working and living and sometimes sharing a small part of their dangers with people for whom freedom is the breath of life itself, and death—just an episode. I have been with little people who were very great. I have seen what makes man more than man, and woman more than woman. I

have seen the tawdry, shameful abdication of frightened or greedy persons who would save their skins or their fortunes at all cost—at any cost. But I have seen, far more often and again and again, the sublime grandeur of a great legion of little people who would make no compromise with falsehoods, murder, slavery, and dishonor. I have seen men and women die and, dying, live forever.”

Mr. Stowe tells of an Aragon peasant “who said good-bye to his wife and four small children, and how he looked back from up the road and saw them standing close together, a forlorn little group of forgotten humanity; and then, without a gun and without any military training, going to face Nazi-Fascist machine-guns and Nazi-Fascist bombers; and how, looking back, the peasant sighed and said to his companion, ‘It is hard to leave them—but there is no other road to freedom.’ Then the peasant strode on, toward the front that was yours and mine.”*

The Birthpangs Of A New World

In considering the sins that are associated with war we are prone to forget the subtler sins of peace. Ezekiel warns Israel in these words: “Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom: pride, fulness of bread, and prosperous ease.”

Have not these men America’s sins, and may it not be that this war has been sent to jolt us out of our pride, selfishness, and prosperous ease? Besides, war has no monopoly of bitterness and hate. Peace, in the sense of cessation of war, doesn’t heal the plague of man’s heart, which is the corruption of his whole nature.

The only peace that will do this is the peace to be established by Jesus Christ, who is “first king of righteousness, and after that also king of peace.”

He, more than all others, saw life steadily and

saw it whole, but was not dismayed or appalled at what He saw.

He foresaw and foretold wars and rumors of war. But He was calm and said to His people: “See that ye be not troubled: for these things must needs come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be famines and earthquakes in divers places. But all these things are the beginning of travail”—that is, of birth pangs.

In this age we are living “between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born.” But Christ will bring to glorious birth that new world wherein will dwell righteousness and peace, the legitimate daughter of righteousness.

“The end is not yet,” but it will surely come. “For the vision is yet for the appointed time, and it hasteth toward the end, and shall not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not delay.” (Habakkuk 2:3.)

“But in the latter days it shall come to pass that many peoples shall say, Come ye, and let us go up to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths. And he will judge between many peoples, and will decide concerning strong nations afar off, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.” (Mich 2:1-4.) Amen and Amen!

*By permission of the publishers, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.

The Church and War

BY GENERAL DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

I appreciate very much the courtesy of the suggestion contained in your note of April 20, 1931, and am glad, indeed, to avail myself of the privilege of commenting on the general subject of the Church in war.

My predominant feeling with reference to the majority of the replies received by your paper from 19,372 clergymen is that of surprise. Surprise at the knowledge that so many of the clergymen of our country have placed themselves on record as repudiating in advance the constitutional obligations that will fall upon them equally with all other elements of our citizenship in supporting the coun-

try in case of need. To exercise privilege without assuming attendant responsibility and obligation is to occupy a position of license, a position apparently sought by men who do not hesitate to avail themselves of the privileges conferred by our democracy upon its citizens, but who in effect proclaim their willingness to see this nation perish rather than participate in its defense.

The question of war and peace is one that rests, under our form of government, in Congress. In exercising this authority, Congress voices the will of the majority, whose right to rule is the cornerstone upon which our governmental edifice is built.

Under the Constitution, its pronouncement on such a question is final, and is obligatory upon every citizen of the United States. That men who wear the cloth of the Church should openly defend repudiation of the laws of the land, with the necessary implications and ramifications arising from such a general attitude toward our statutes, seems almost unbelievable. It will certainly hearten every potential or actual criminal and malefactor who either has or contemplates breaking some other law. Anomalous as it seems, it apparently stamps the clergyman as a leading exponent of law violation at individual pleasure.

I am mindful of the right accorded every American citizen to endeavor by lawful means to secure such changes in the Constitution or statutes as he may desire. But to concede to him the right to defy existing law is to recognize a state of anarchy and the collapse of properly constituted authority. May I remark, also, that if we acknowledge the prerogative of the individual to disregard the obligations placed upon him by American citizenship, it seems only logical to ask him to forego all rights guaranteed by such citizenship.

It also surprises me that while apparently entering a plea for freedom of conscience, these clergymen are attempting to dictate to the consciences of those who honestly differ from them over questions of national defense. Their sentiments and implied efforts are injecting the Church into the affairs of State and endangering the very principle that they claim to uphold. Perhaps the greatest privilege of our country, which indeed was the genius of its foundation, is religious freedom. Religious freedom, however, can exist only so long as government survives. To render our country helpless would invite destruction not only of our political and economic freedom, but also of our religion.

Another surprise comes in the revelation that so many seem to be unfamiliar with the struggle of mankind for the free institutions that we enjoy. Magna Charta, The Declaration of Independence, The Emancipation Proclamation, the rights of small nations, and other birthrights of this generation have been bought with the high price of human suffering and human sacrifice, much of it on the fields of battle.

I am surprised that men of clear and logical minds confuse defensive warfare with the disease which it alone can cure when all other remedies have failed. Do they not know that police systems and armed national defense are the human agencies made necessary by the deep-seated disease of individual depravity, the menace of personal greed and hatred? Should not these clergymen turn their attention to the individual sinner and rid the country of crime rather than attack the national keepers

of the peace, the most potent governmental agency yet devised for this very purpose? It is a distinct disappointment to know that men who are called to wield the sword of the spirit are deluded into believing that the mechanical expedient of disarming men will transform hatred into love, and selfishness into altruism.

May I also express surprise that some have lost sight of the fact that in none of our past wars have clergymen been required to bear arms, and that under the terms of the Geneva Convention, ratified by the United States in 1907 (Section 130 and 132), chaplains are noncombatants and not authorized to be armed. And if United States Army chaplains are ever guilty of using inflammatory propaganda, such activity is without warrant or authority by any statute or order ever promulgated in the history of the country.

Perhaps I should also remind them that under the terms of the League of Nations the United States would be required to maintain a standing army of at least a half million men in order to be able to carry out its mandates. I am curious to know how many of the clergymen who voted for the League have read the articles and understand that under them the peace of the world is to be maintained in the last analysis by armed military forces. It is difficult to reconcile the faith of these people in the efficacy of newly organized international agencies to keep the peace and enforce respect for international covenants with their self-confessed intention to violate the existing laws of their own long-established government.

A few questions occur to me that could appropriately be asked the clergymen who replied to your questionnaire. In stating that they were in favor of the United States taking the lead in reducing armament, even if compelled to make greater proportionate reductions than other countries might be willing to make, did they know that the existing total of our land forces, including Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves, is about one-third of one per cent of our population? Did they know that in other great countries, except Germany whose army is limited by treaty, this ratio is from three to forty-five times as great? Did they know our total forces in actual size are exceeded by those of at least fifteen other nations, although in population we are exceeded only by Russia, China and India? Finally, did they consider the words of our Lord as given in the twenty-first verse of the eleventh chapter of St. Luke: "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace"?

In all modesty may I not say to the opponents of national defense that our Lord, who preached the Sermon on the Mount, later in His career declared: "Think not that I am come to send peace

on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matthew 10:34). It is my humble belief that the religion which He came to establish is based upon sacrifice, and that men and women who follow in His train are called by it to the defense of certain priceless principles even at the cost of their own lives. And I can think of no principles more high and holy than those for which our national sacrifices have been made in the past. History teaches us that religion and patriotism have always gone hand in hand, while atheism has invariably been accompanied by radicalism, communism, bolshevism, and other enemies of free government.

Have not those who oppose our modern and reasonable efforts for national defense miscalculated the temper and innate spirit of patriotism in the average American? The fact that our citizens' military training camps are oversubscribed long

before the opening of the camps comforts me that patriotism is still a dominant power in our land. Any organization which opposes the defense of homeland and the principles hallowed by the blood of our ancestors, which sets up internationalism in the place of patriotism, which teaches the passive submission of right to the forces of the predatory strong, cannot prevail against the demonstrated staunchness of our population. I confidently believe that a red-blooded and virile humanity which loves peace devotedly, but is willing to die in the defense of the right, is Christian from center to circumference, and will continue to be dominant in the future as in the past.

*This article appeared in "The Army & Navy Register," under date of June 6, 1931, and was reprinted in the same periodical, January 24, 1942, and here reprinted by their special permission.

Why Go On?

BY REV. SAMUEL McP. GLASGOW, D.D.

"Lo, I am with you alway." Matthew 28:20.
"And he (Jesus) . . . was in the ship . . ." Mark 4:38.

"Therefore . . . we faint not." II. Corinthians 4:1.

In these darkening days, with relentless tragedy crowding men off the accustomed path of life, as we stand before the open door of an unknown future, this is a primary question, pressing for an adequate answer — "why go on?" Men everywhere must front this question. Many have fumbled their answers. Some have let life sag and become careless and cold. Some have quit trying. Some have quit forever.

Life's gravity current will serve men for a while, for a sunny while, but there comes a day, it always comes, when we must scrutinize and weigh life. When we do, we find that life demands a motive worthy, adequate, always available.

Thoughtful spirits constantly turn to this motive, they feel for it, they must be sure it is there, and they must have their souls certified to the fact that it is worthy.

Often life becomes snarled, twisted and knotted! Some sin admitted! Some testing tragedy! Some sudden change! Is it worthwhile, we say to our troubled heart, to sit down and patiently untangle it all again? Why? Why go on?

Centuries ago when another war was raging in

the land of ancient Gaul, a boatman had a high commission to carry a leader, whose identity he did not know, across a dark lake, through the biting wind and the bitter cold, and the beating waves. When the journey was half accomplished, the boatman felt his strength almost spent. The moon broke forth now and then from behind the scuttling clouds, revealing his passenger silent and impassive. Suddenly the royal passenger, sensing the crisis, arose in the boat, threw back his heavy cloak and revealing his royal identity said, "Row on, my man, row on, your boat carries Cæsar!"

The preciousness of the cargo gives a new courage and motive to the skipper. It summons an inexplicable determination. It issues in otherwise impossible accomplishments. "Row on, my man, row on, your boat carries Cæsar."

Your Boat Carries Your Own Personality

"Most of the shadows of the earth are caused by standing in our own sunlight." Or, as we might express it in other words, "Most of the soot that soils our walls comes from our own chimneys."

Your life, your one life, your one brief life, is in your boat. You are the skipper. You must determine its experiences, accomplishments, issues, destinies.

We can lift life high and turn its facets one after another to catch the changing color and beauty and light. Or we can let life fade and die

amidst things trivial, unworthy, or soiling. The issue is determined by the inner spiritual altitude.

The story is told of Dr. Johnson, to whom a royal messenger was sent with a shilling for a poem he had written. Disdainfully casting the coin at the messenger's feet, he said: "My king sends me a shilling for a poem because I live in an alley. Go and tell him 'your soul lives in an alley.'" It's not a question primarily for us, "where do you live?" The thing that really counts is "where does your soul live?" Many a man lives on the boulevard or in the exclusive residential section, but alas his "soul lives in an alley."

Constant pressure is on us for the finest choices. How vital it is to be discriminating; to select things that are pure and fair, true and of good report. They will be built into the permanent pattern which we shall wear. No one else can skipper our boat. Tragic, indeed, it is to find when it is growing late, life's sun is about to set, that we have fastened our lives to something shoddy. Our daily choices, our constant actions, put the ceiling, the granite ceiling, upon our future life and declare whether it shall be hampered and constricted, or limitless and free.

Life—fine life—will not be easy. It is not built after that fashion and some of us are glad that this is true. The daughter of the South's most distinguished commercial chemist, the late Dr. Charles Herty, is said to have had this experience: Home for Christmas holidays, her report in Vassar showed that she had excelled in everything but Botany. Talking it over with her father she expressed the desire to drop Botany. Her father consented, but added, "If I were you I wouldn't drop Botany, I'd master it." With no further conversation about it she returned to her school after the holidays and at the Commencement was awarded a scholarship in Botany. After her graduation a fellowship in Botany was given to her at a graduate university and when her preparation was completed she returned to Vassar to teach Botany.

"Row on, my man." Let every ounce of strength and courage be spent. The cargo is precious and is worthy of our best.

Before we move to our second objective, may I say this further word? Many of the "reverences" of other days have lapsed. We have lost them and the world is poorer and life is not quite so fine. They have to do with our endurance and courage. Years ago a girl tourist was visiting in Europe the museum where Beethoven's piano is kept as a sacred relic. When the guard was some distance away she sat down and played the instrument, contrary to all regulations. The guard returned and said, "Paderewski visited this shrine recently." To which the young girl, in eagerness to enlarge her experience, said, "I suppose he also played on

this piano?" "He did not," said the guard, "he said 'I am not worthy.'"

There is a strength in modesty and a power in self-discipline, and a peace in humility, none of which is found apart from these high possessions.

Your Boat Carries Other Personalities

I carry you. You carry me, and Mrs. Glasgow. You carry each other. Some of you in this audience are carrying a boy who may be at Pearl Harbor or Manila. Their happiness, their welfare, their destinies. You carry them. Life is inevitably interlocked. No man liveth to himself.

Love is a bond which hardship, separation, time, and even disgrace, can not annul. Your life is forevermore linked with those who pray and who have loved and paved the way for your feet hitherto. They travel in your boat for weal or woe. Every generation stems from the one proceeding and controls and colors the one to follow. This relationship is costly but when courageously carried is exceedingly precious.

There is a beautiful story of a young man talking with an old sage, whose maturity saw life in all its fullness. The youth is manifestly shocked and baffled by the agonizing groans of the toilers whom he hears far below in the valley. "Who are those and what are they doing?" he asked. The old sage said: "They are the workers. They are those who live not unto themselves; they are pouring out their lives patiently and with the finest sort of consecration to bridge the cataract that roars beneath and cuts across the path of life." Pausing just a moment, the old sage looks at the youth and says, "Will you go down and join them or will you choose only the easy paths of pleasure?" The boy hesitates, splendid, undecided, waiting, and then he hears the tramp-tramp-tramp behind him. "What is that?" he says to the sage. "That," replied the old man, "is the tread of a thousand feet, young and eager, pressing the path toward the valley and the cataract." With a light in his eye that spoke of a soul that knew the call of God when the accents fell upon his ears, the young man hesitated no longer: "I will go down," he said.

Your boat carries others, those closest to you, those who mean most to you, and those to whom you mean the most. Life will be constricted, often barren, unless we remember the obligation. I shall never forget the tender tears of appreciation in the eyes of a strong man as he told me the story of what had happened to his boy at school, concerning whom we had counselled the summer before. His son had gone to his first year at boarding school. Dear friends of mine, of whom I had told him, had given the son a birthday party and helped him over the homesick period. And then suddenly the boy was stricken. A serious operation

was indicated. There was no time to even notify the parents before the operation must be performed. The tender care of these friends, into whose hands this boy had fallen, had left such an impression upon this father and this mother that they were thanking me for a simple service that I had forgotten until they brought it to mind. Have a care, parents. Build the boys and girls strong and fine and true and free. Your life is indissolubly bound with theirs. Have a care, successful business men, professional men, leaders among men and women! Many lives are linked to yours of whom you are entirely unconscious and the blessing or the blight that falls upon them you may never know until the books are open. Your life may yield an upsurge, a lifting power, a strength. Or it may cause men to stumble and bruise themselves and life is spoiled and hearts are hurt and harmed. "Row on, my man, row on. Your boat carries others."

Your Boat Carries Christ

After a busy day, tired and spent, he sleeps in the bow of the little ship on Galilee, centuries ago. "And He (Jesus) . . . was in the ship." He is in your boat today, fellow-Christians, and He is not asleep. Your boat carries Christ. This, however, does not insure a tranquil voyage. Ah, no. Quite the contrary; for these disciples toiling with the sea encountered the direst storm of their experience. All their craft and knowledge was exhausted and yet the boat was filling with water. Here was a storm beyond their experience and power. So it may be with your life and mine. So possibly it has been with us. But remember that there is not only the wind, shredding the sails, and the waves, beating over the little ship, there is also and always the "peace be still," and the power to quiet the angry waves.

The unfolding of Christ's plan, the issues of His holy purpose, the evidences of His love—these you carry, fellow-Christians, in your boat, in your life. His interests are linked with you for today and tomorrow. How He is depending upon us!

All that many men know of Jesus is from the way you skipper your boat; for they know He is in your boat. "Lo, I am with you alway," and He (Jesus) was in the ship"; therefore, "we faint not."

Many lives today are hurt and confused. Tender feet are stumbling and fumbling in life and many Christians are finding the way steep and the burden very heavy. "Most of the difficulties of trying to live the Christian life arise from trying to half-live it." Men toy with Christianity, they play with it. They do not believe what Jesus said about Himself, and about their utter need and about eternal destinies.

*"I lived for myself, I thought for myself,
For myself and none beside;
Just as if Jesus had never lived,
And as if He had never died."*

When I left Knoxville, Tenn., and took up my work in Savannah, beloved, I was in my study one day preparing a message on the text, "Sir, We Would See Jesus." As I sat there it seemed to me that the policeman from the corner, who guides the children safely across the street from school, the shop people, the business women, the professional men, the colored man in the elevator—one after another they came up my study steps and with one voice seemed to say: "Learning, eloquence, gifts, you may or may not have, but we are not concerned for them. Is there not something, or some one who has the answer to life? If we could only really see Him, and be sure of the path! Sir, we would see Jesus, in you and through you."

That experience crystallized into a bronze plate which meets me on the level of my eyes every time I go down my steps into my pulpit and on that plate is the legend—*Sir, We Would See Jesus.*

I must never lose my sense of responsibility and the poignant reality that my boat carries Christ.

The first day that I spoke in the pulpit of the Independent Presbyterian Church, I said: "I have come to Savannah and to the Independent Church to love you and to serve you and to make the Name of Jesus glorious in this midst." Ah, beloved, that name is the only light that does not flicker in the storm. There is no wind created that can blow it out. But your own light, it may be selfish and darkened. Yes, some one has well said, "Your light will go out, unless it goes out, far out, steadily, always out."

God's great leader of other days, Moses, sensing the load upon his heart as he notes the wilderness journey and the order of a Nation's life therein, cries, "If thy presence go not with me carry us not up hence." Swiftly and completely, Jehovah answers, "My presence shall go with thee and I will give thee rest." The generation with Moses passes and his successor, Joshua, in the same confidence, leads on. At the end of his mighty career we hear Joshua saying: "And behold this day I am going the way of all the earth; and ye know in all your hearts, and in all your soul, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you. All are come to pass unto you, and not one thing has failed thereof."

Why go on? Why step across the threshold of a threatening, unknown future? We can be sure that testings of furnace intensity await us on the journey.

Your boat carries your own life. It carries the

lives of others. And it carries Christ. He has a task. He has a testimony. He has a service. He has a dedication. It awaits those who hear, who understand, who undertake.

Shading His eyes He scans the far distant horizon where men and life are badly broken. He sees the reign of the dark shadows of sin. Leveling His arm and pointing to the conflict, His eyes upon

you and upon me, He says: "All power is given unto me . . . go ye therefore . . ."

And as we poise and wait, we hear him adding this glowing word: "Remember, you do not go alone. Lo, I am with you alway." "For He (Jesus) was in the ship." Beloved, hear me, "Therefore, we faint not!"

A United Church

BY REV. D. S. GAGE, D.D.

The statement that "A divided Church can never conquer the world" is one frequently heard. Like all "slogans", it is likely to lead to careless and hasty consideration of the matter it concerns. In what sense is the word conquer used? What sort of conquest is in mind? Does it mean the winning of the heathen world to Christianity? Certainly, till this is done, the Church cannot be said to have conquered the world. The Master's command, "Go ye into all the world, etc." will not be fulfilled till the Church has done that. But will organic union of the now divided denominations further this end? Do members of unions which have been consummated do more **after** union for Foreign Missions than the separated churches did before? The facts do not so testify. In Canada, does the united church give more for Foreign Missions and send out more missionaries than the formerly separated denominations? Figures do not so testify. Then mere union into one body will not of itself increase any member's zeal for the Lord, for His Gospel, nor for the spread of the Gospel. Why should it? In fact, the effect of union into a body, larger than the formerly separated bodies, is likely to have the opposite effect by making individuals feel that **now** their individual responsibility is not as great as it was before union. Figures show that the United Presbyterian Church has lead other denominations in per capita gifts. Why? Several reasons. And one certainly is that they have undertaken pretty heavy loads and members must do their part if the work is not to fail. Organic union with the Church U.S.A. had several times been considered. It has been declined by the United Church. Suppose they had united, would that fact have increased the gifts and zeal of the members of the United Presbyterians? Why should it have had such an effect? Would it not almost certainly have made them feel that now the responsibility was not as great individually as before union because now they were members of a very large organization, which is wealthy besides? Mere union will not help spread the Gospel to foreign and heathen lands.

But, next, before the world is conquered for Christ there must be the real subjection of our home country to His will. The U. S. is nominally Christian,—so called because other religions here are very small in comparison with Protestant and Catholic Churches. But is it really a Christian land? As a nation does it obey the rule and seek to do the will of our Master? **Very far from it.** A very wise man learned in history and government said to me many years ago, "There has never

been a Christian Government in the world." Is he not right? And in our own land how many are out of Christ? Does the above slogan have this conquest in mind? Here, again, will union of itself alone increase evangelistic zeal on the part of our members? Will it help to make our Government more Christian? Further, does this conquest of the nation mean that all shall be led to accept Christ? If so, it is something that will never occur because there are some who **will not come** to Him. Further, will they be led to accept Him better by a church united outwardly but whose members do not all believe the same about Christ? Some who believe in His Deity,—some who do not,—some who believe He saves men by a vicarious atonement,—some thinking quite otherwise? Will not such a church speak with divided counsels? Would not a group all of whom has a belief which they held with firm assurance speak to men with more effect? And, does this conquest of the nation by the "united" church mean that the nation shall be cured of its grievous sins? Does it mean that intoxicants shall no longer be sold, that divorce shall cease save for the scriptural grounds, that other deep-seated national sins shall be eliminated and if this is the conquest which it is hoped and asserted that a united church can win, can union bring this about? It is clear that a united church including all denominations as things now are will have no specific beliefs. I read today an appeal for "unity of faith" on the part of all Christians. Would to God that it might come if it should be the Faith which is pleasing to God! But who shall bring us to that unity? Can any one accomplish it but the Holy Spirit? And is it not clear that man-made attempts bringing an outward unity can only delay the day of real inward unity of true Faith?

Evangelistic zeal on the part of individuals is increased when Christians realize that it is the duty of every disciple to preach the Word. A church of which I know recently undertook to use its members in personal work for Christ. Of course not all could be effectively used. But putting their personal responsibility before the membership, and using them, there was a large ingathering this Easter. Organic union would have had no part in arousing such zeal. That is, organic union by itself, alone. No, mere organic union will do absolutely nothing toward conquering the world for Christ, either here or among the heathen of the world.

But, it may be said that the mere spectacle of a divided Church has a powerful influence upon

those who are outside the Church, and makes them less willing to accept Christ, when they see denominations quarreling, disagreeing on points, which to them seem trivial, and so on. But, on the other hand, if a man not a Christian, is asked to accept Christ as his Saviour, and told by any one who so approaches him,—that this is the heart of the matter,—and if he then thinks of membership in some Church, is it not the case that the very fact of differing denominations, each having its special doctrines, its methods of worship, and its “atmosphere”, makes it easier for him to find a congenial group with which he can henceforth serve his master more effectively than if he found but one group? The Holy Spirit has not lead all Christians wrongly when men have gone out from other groups and formed new denominations. The Wesleys were certainly not wrongly led. God certainly used them for His glory. Indeed, if the history of the formation of any special denomination is studied and one finds WHY that denomination was formed,—one will be surprised to find how the very fact that men often suffered, for what they thought important truth, made their zeal increase, brought souls into the Kingdom, wrought for the glory of God;—and in turn the church from any band separated was in practically every case led to consider itself, reform what seemed wrong, and in turn their zeal for the Master grew. Witness the “Counter Reformation” in the Catholic Church caused by the Reformation, witness the effect on the cold and almost spiritually dead Church of England, when the “Methodies”, as they were then called, withdrew because of its deadness.

How long does this increased zeal and power last? This is not the same in all cases. After a time it is apt to decline,—and especially if it happens that the circumstances which caused separation pass away.

Should separated denominations, therefore, never unite organically? Is the effect always bad on individual zeal? By no means. If the reason is **mere** union—if the so-called union conceals deep underlying differences so that there is no real unity in the united church, the result can hardly fail to be disastrous. But when two churches know that they are essentially one in all great doctrines of the faith, if their modes of work are closely alike, if the union has been carefully considered and all are convinced that the larger church can do work more effectively than the separated churches, there is good reason for union. Such a union seems to be that of the Evangelical and Reformed Churches. Both almost wholly German in membership, with similar customs, so that any member would feel “at home” in any church of the united church; of much the same size, so that neither feels that it is being absorbed by a larger body; and that whatever distinctive contributions it had made in the past, made towards the Lord’s work, would still be made, (and it is to make this distinctive contribution that nearly all denominations **began** their existence) both agreed on doctrines of the faith, neither bringing in any such number of those who do not really accept their creeds—or as one might call them “liberals,” as to disturb the inner harmony of the union, such a union seems justified and wise.

But all these circumstances should be present before there can be any union which will bring increased glory to the Kingdom. Where there are deep differences—where the church contains those

who believe and those who disbelieve in the Inspiration of the Bible,—who believe and disbelieve that Jesus was the Christ, the son of the living God,—that He is God incarnate in the flesh, or do not believe this,—those who believe in the Virgin Birth and those to whom it is a legend,—those who believe in the Resurrection and those who think it to be explained by some sort of hope for their Lord that caused the apostles and others to think they actually saw Him risen, when He never rose from the Dead,—those who believe that the Son of God died to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God, and those who will say, as did one prominent writer some years ago, (I quote in substance) “I do not know what the Atonement did for man; it must have been something important else it would not have taken place; but I am sure of one thing,—that it was not to pay the penalty for the sins of man”,—or those who can say about the Virgin Birth that instead of its being proof of the real Deity of Jesus, as did one man in a letter to me,—(again in substance, but accurately), “I never could see what difference the manner of fertilization of a biological germ cell made”; and one might go on at length,—when such differences are present, there is only surface union. Beneath there are differences which will either again divide the church, or that not happening, will **effectively** choke the testimony to sound doctrine of those who hold it in the united church. Why will this happen? For exactly the same reason that bad money circulated freely with good will always drive out the good money. Unsound doctrine freely taught in the same church with sound doctrine will inevitably neutralize the preaching of the sound faith. And in such differences of doctrine as those named above, both can not be sound. Both can not be true. One may be the real Gospel. If so, the other must be what Paul calls anathema. Not even to be called “another Gospel” for whichever is the true Gospel the other is too far different to be called a “Gospel” at all.

One might also consider this. Even if all Protestant churches became one in some sort of union, there would still remain the Roman Catholic and the once great Greek Catholic church. When will the church cease to be divided? Only when the Holy Spirit brings us together in real unity of the Faith. And that time waits His pleasure. It will not come by hasty attempts by man to frame unions which are not unions but conceal within themselves the seeds of disunion or of complete surrender of sound doctrine.

Let us further note a very common thing all over this U. S. By the side of the larger Protestant churches, there spring up such churches as the Church of the Nazarene,—the Pentecostal Church, the Church of God, and others. Why do they spring up? I have had some earnest correspondence on this matter with the President of one of our Seminaries. In every community there are those who feel themselves in some way “out of place” in the regular churches. They may feel that the members are above them socially, educationally, or have other reasons. So they form their own churches, of those like themselves in all these respects. Also, (and this was the subject of the correspondence spoken of above) the preaching in our regular churches is “above their heads”, or not to their edification. I know a prosperous town of 900 inhabitants, in the heart of the corn belt of Illinois. It has had for a good many years two fairly strong churches,—a Methodist and a Chris-

tian. The country surrounding was of well-to-do or even rich farmers. Many were well educated. Naturally, those who were interested in religion were members of those two churches. But there was a considerable element who would not attend, for such reasons as given above. A Church of the Nazarene has been founded whose membership is now about equal to either of the others. And it has done great good. No one can question that who knows the community. And, let us never forget that as long as we have an open Bible,—as long as men are free to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences,—just so long will men form denominations of those who think alike, wish to worship in the same manner, like to listen to preaching of the same sort.

If all Protestant Churches in the U. S. would unite, it would not be six months till bands would separate if our freedoms were preserved. This division is not by any means an unmixed evil as

some would have us believe. Before one can prove that, let him prove the insincerity of those who thus separate; let him prove that none of them have the Holy Spirit in their hearts. Let him prove that none of them save souls and do not build up their members in the knowledge of Christ. And also let him consider the terms of general union. For manifestly, a few unions get us nowhere to a **united church**. Such a federal union can come only by the sacrifice of all doctrinal belief. And such a church would have no undivided message with which to "**conquer the world**." It would speak many messages of different sorts which would be worse than the present denominations, for its messages would have no power because they would neutralize each other. When a band of believers in the Lord Jesus, are of one faith, of one mind, then and then only will such a group testify with that power which can save. Let no other union be considered than such a one.

The Aims and Purposes of The Federal Council

BY REV. DANIEL IVERSON, D.D.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the question of the Southern Presbyterian Church remaining in the Council and what are the true aims of this organization, are burning questions in the Southern Presbyterian Church today.

By way of introduction to these questions, we should canvass our present connection with it. Because of the Birth Control stand of the Council in 1930-31, the Southern Presbyterian Church withdrew. The council immediately took stock and officially modified its position on this question. Persistent efforts after this modification to have our church re-enter the council caused a referendum to be sent down to the Presbyteries in 1937. The vote of the Presbyteries was 48 against entrance into the council, 38 for and two not voting. The Assembly took the advice of the Presbyteries and decided against re-entering the council in 1938. The Federal Council was still persistent and determined. To the surprise of the church the 1941 Assembly voted our denomination into this body. A strong minority in the Assembly urged the body to do as in 1937; send the question back to the Presbyteries. This minority felt, since this precedent was established by a former Assembly just three years back, and since the answer on the question was definite at that time, it was only right that the Presbyteries be asked if they had changed their minds. There was evidence of duress in pressing this question at the 1941 Assembly. Having entered the council has opened this old sore in our church and we need to canvass the question again. So we ask what is the Federal Council and what are its aims and purposes?

The Federal Council was organized in 1905 to give denominations a rallying point on questions concerning religious and social work in America. Its primary purpose was to unify the religious forces of America. The Organization caused both conservative and liberal forces to rally to this

plea for Christian unity. The unfortunate part of the history of this organization, is, its thinking and planning have been largely in the hands of those who have followed a more liberal theology than that of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Names such as Dean Geo. Hodges, H. L. Morehouse, David H. Bauslin, Frank Mason North, W. H. P. Faunce, H. L. Willett, W. F. McDowell, Shailer Matthews, C. A. Steiner, Rausenbusch, Geo. Elliot, C. L. Stetzle are found to be the directors of the council's thinking. This does not include the list of those leading in its work to-day whose liberal theology is pretty well known throughout our land.

A new book has recently been written on the Federal Council entitled, "We Are Not Divided" by John A. Hutchinson. This book which is "a critical and historical study of the Federal Council" gives what is purported to be an accurate picture of the aims and purposes of this organization. In the introduction Mr. Hutchinson writes, "It remains only to express my gratitude to the many people who have helped with this study. The members of the Federal Council staff have given generously of their time and judgment. Professors Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert Hastings Nichols and Henry P. VanDusen of Union Seminary (New York) and Professor Ernest Johnson of Columbia University.—My thanks are tendered to the staff of the library of Union Seminary. Especially I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to Professor Herbert Schneider of the Department of Philosophy of Columbia University who supervised this study and contributed many helpful and clarifying suggestions". With this kind of help we are sure we have received from the pen of Mr. Hutchinson a fairly accurate picture of the aims and purposes of this influential body.

One of the aims of this organization has been and still is to bring about a unity that will be more than federal and without particular regard

to theology. Mr. Hutchinson in his book states, "The Council's thought about itself, about denominationalism and about church union generally has been pragmatic and if one may use the term without derogatory implications, opportunistic". H. Paul Douglas, a committee member according to Mr. Hutchinson made this statement in a report, "they (denominations) no longer have the social necessity which originally justified their existence and their significance for their adherents is changed from high powered inner authority to pale custom". Mr. Hutchinson says, "A sociological criterion would demand that denominations justify their existence, if they are able at the bar of society utility". While opposition to unity kept the council from taking action on the Douglas report "nevertheless from time to time, particularly in recent years it has been asserted that existing federation must in time give way to more complete and organic types of church unity. In 1937 this was officially recognized by the council by the appointment of a committee "For the Study of Christian Unity". "In this connection we may note the view of Dr. Samuel M. Cavert (well known to Southern General Assemblies) that federal union may become organic. The only way of securing a still larger unity either of spirit or organization is to strengthen the cooperative and federate processes which are already under way". Dr. Luther Weigle, newly elected president of the Federal Council, predicts the creation of the North American Council of Churches which is another step in this unifying process.

Any participation toward unity with an organization so thoroughly out of harmony with the beliefs and practices of the Southern Presbyterian would be worse than a compromise.

Its views on matters pertaining to Theology would bear mentioning at this point. While it has been expressly stated that Theology is not a subject to be discussed and settled in the conferences, nevertheless opinions and beliefs have been stated and these views are "expressed in action" frequently. One of the first things decided upon was to give new meaning to the traditional language of the church. "The traditional notion of sin has been broadened to make room for social wrongs". "Denunciation of social wrongs has taken on the aspect of traditional evangelical religion". Bishop McConnell, one of the leading lights of the Council in past years, said, "One could perhaps describe the major interest of the Federal Council during the thirty years of its existence in its own term of 'kingdom building'. In this work all the traditional Christian symbols got a new significance. The vicarious atonement of Christ thus became 'the way of the cross' a social principle of non-violence and sacrifice to be apprehended and applied to all social relationships. Mr. Hutchinson in his book, referring to the 1934 meeting at which time Dr. Geo. W. Richards spoke, said, "It is explicitly pointed out what the gospel is not.—First it is not what is popularly known as personal salvation from sin and free entrance into eternal life. It includes forgiveness of sin and personal salvation but these are by products of the kingdom of God. Out of the Council's conception of man grows its pernicious doctrine of the social gospel. Mr. Hutchinson states, "Recognizing the Council as the precipitation of the Social Gospel into institutional form, it is not surprising to find embedded in much of its program the ideas of divine immanence, human goodness and progress and the like, which have been outstanding traits of the

Social Gospel from the beginning. Particularly is this true of the estimate of human nature. Indeed the worth and dignity of man might well be termed the keystone of all the Council's social thought and action. To be sure, the Council has always taken pains to point out that the sacredness of man's life is derived from his sonship to God. **Yet it may be said of this relationship that the son reflects much credit on the father**". "In general the doctrine of sin and depravity have been played down in relation to the divine image". This view of man is the foundation upon which the Social Gospel of the Council was built.

The Social Gospel, it is claimed, is "the response of American Christianity to modern industrial society." The Federal Council is treated "quite correctly as an official institutional embodiment of the Social Gospel". "The Social Gospel arose and has flourished under the influence of what may broadly speaking be termed a liberal theology which today is being questioned in many quarters". There is a real question in the mind of Mr. Hutchinson that the Social Gospel could survive if this so called 'liberal theology' was renounced.

The purpose of this Social Gospel which is the avowed purpose of the Federal Council is to bring about the Kingdom of God upon the earth through education, improving relationships in the field of economics and by the establishment of a world brotherhood. This Kingdom of God complex does not necessarily involve conversion to Jesus Christ. Bishop McConnell declared in 1928, "We seek to bring about a social atmosphere and a condition of things in communities throughout the world in which great saintliness becomes possible". Lynch and Gulick both said, "The kingdom of God is identified exclusively with a world wide brotherhood". "Christians must seek to establish the Kingdom of God on a world wide scale through methods of international righteousness and helpfulness". Such ideas, dreams and efforts are not in accordance with God's way of establishing His kingdom as revealed in His word. The movement could well be Christian Science, Jewish, Unitarian, Agnostic or what have you. Christ as a person is in the center of the Kingdom of God in the Scriptures. The Kingdom of God in the Federal Council does not necessarily need Christ. Christian principles are more important than He is.

The Federal Council's policy of pacifism and disarmament has proved to be disastrous and a reflection upon the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Our Confession of Faith says, "God the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him over the people, for his own glory and the public good and to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword". . . . "They may lawfully now under the New Testament wage war upon just and necessary occasions". The Federal Council in its "Memorial on World Peace" said, "To support war is to deny the Gospel we profess to believe". The Council's policy of disarmament and her well known opposition to the Japanese embargo have contributed much to our own lack of preparedness for the hour of tragedy that has come upon us.

The Federal Council's interference in industrial matters particularly the Hershey Incident of 1938 is enough justification for our feeling that the Southern Presbyterian Church should not endorse the activities of the Industrial Secretary of the Federal Council by our membership in it. The

effort to impose upon a community the CIO when the community had not invited the organization in and to have Mr. Myers advocate it publicly, led to bloodshed and trouble in that area. The ministers of Hershey should be asked for their side in this incident.

In the Honea Path affair in South Carolina Dr. Worth M. Tippy advocated in the meeting held there that the unions were always right and must be followed by the laboring man.

Having as briefly as possible canvassed some of the aims and purposes of this organization from sources that are about as official as we are able to attain them at this time, we would conclude in the light of the above that the Southern Presby-

terian Church cannot allow any organization with such views, aims and purposes to become its official representative in any field.

The history of our connection with this organization has indeed been a disturbing history. Why should we be subjected year after year with this Kingdom of God complex. It can never be realized because it has never been realized. We are saved by grace, through faith. Not of works lest any man should boast. We should not only withdraw from the council but we should declare a sort of moratorium against the councils appearance upon the floor of the Assembly for at least five years so that we can be rid of this discussion for a season.

Independent Presbyterian Church

SAVANNAH . GEORGIA

Two weeks of clear and demanding preaching, covering the great essentials of our Faith, through the winsome personality of Rev. Gipsy Smith, Jr., closed here on April 5. They have greatly blessed our people.

Mr. Smith's messages centered in the cardinal doctrines which bulwark the Gospel of the Grace of God. His dealing with Sin was masterful and searching, and yet, patient and understanding. His emphasis on Regeneration was royally clear and appeared in almost every message which he brought. Justification and Sanctification, in terms inescapable for the average mind and heart, were fearlessly projected.

Mr. Smith's preaching on these great doctrines profoundly stirred our people and our officers, drew great crowds and issued in widespread, lasting blessing. Twenty-four have already united with our Church, of whom sixteen have come upon confession. The vast spiritual issues of such a meeting can never be measured by statistics. This is the third great evangelistic campaign which Mr. Smith has held in Savannah. His campaigns have been in the years 1922, 1932, and 1942.

Bombing Raid Described In Book Of Isaiah

It is impossible for God's children to find themselves in situations shut off from His love. Seven hundred years before Christ the Holy Spirit directed Isaiah to describe accurately and minutely a bombing raid. Even in the horrors of modern warfare we can find in Him peace and strength. Listen to these words,—“For thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall.” Isaiah 25:4.

—L.N.B.

MY SON

(These lines were written by the mother of one of the lads who took his place on the Nation's "Honor Roll" when the ill-fated submarine, the S-26, went down in the waters of Panama after the collision of January 24, 1942. They are published here as a tribute to the faith and courage of American Motherhood!)

I do not ask the reason why
God took my son,
So full of youth and love of all the beautiful,
His work had just begun.
There are no accidents to those who know and understand,
With an all-wise Heavenly Father,
It was a part of His great plan,
And on that dark and fateful night,
Entombed beneath the sea,
I know Oh Christ! he lived and died in Thee—
And with his simple, steadfast faith
Helped others, not as strong as he,
To see the glory of Thy Grace.
This war should not be a race for might,
For only as we see the Light—
God hung on Calvary,
Will victory be won.
Though bowed beneath my cross of grief,
I lift my tear-dimmed eyes to Him,
And humbly say—
Thy will be done.

Twenty-Five Cents

I am twenty-five cents.
I am not on speaking terms with the butcher.
I am too small to buy a quart of ice cream.
I am not large enough to purchase a box of candy.
I am too small to buy a ticket to a movie.
I am hardly fit for a tip, but—believe me, when I go to church on Sunday, I am considered **some money!**

BOOK REVIEWS

Prayer

By George A. Buttrick. Published By
Abingdon-Cokesbury. Price \$2.75.

Prayer has become stylish in many places in the last few years. The psychiatrist recommends it, and the physician prescribes it. The skeptical attitude toward prayer that prevailed in some quarters, is disappearing. Before we take too much encouragement from this, however, it is well to realize that many people differ in their concept of prayer and its efficacy. Some have no faith in prayer beyond its reflex influence. Others believe in the instrumental value of prayer as well as its reflex influence.

Those who have read Dr. Buttrick's former volume, *"The Christian Faith And Modern Doubt,"* will be prepared to find the author helpful in some of his statements, but unsafe to follow in others. Dr. Buttrick apparently has a low view of the absolute authority of the Bible in all of its assertions, and a high view of the theory of evolution and biblical criticism.

The discriminating reader will find some parts of this book worth underscoring and using in the future. Here are a few samples: "The science which poked fun at an 'anthropomorphic God,' is now found guilty of an 'anthropomorphic Science.'" "Materialism in its present form seems doomed, for if all thought is dust, Science is dust." "Luncheon clubs hail His Golden Rule, but do they pray? We cannot keep the Golden Rule and discard the prayer. The prophets of social justice proclaim Him champion of the poor, and they are right, but do they pray? We cannot keep His compassion, and discard His prayers." "We are creatures, and know not anything. We cannot create; we can but fashion clumsily from materials which God gives to hand and mind."

The average layman will not find this volume easy reading. Perhaps it was not written for the layman. The layman who wants a book on prayer to help him over the rough places of life, would find the little volume written some years ago by Andrew Murray, called, *"With Christ In The School Of Prayer,"* more useful.

The working pastor will doubtless find his money's worth in this book, as there are passages he may use advantageously in his private devotional life as well as in the preparation of his sermons. He will draw more inspiration to actually pray, however, from such a volume as Alexander Whyte's *"Lord Teach Us To Pray."* After all, the final test of any book on prayer is, does it constrain and impel the reader to really pray?

—John R. Richardson.

Booklets For Soldiers

We would like to commend two booklets, *"Officers And Service Men Look At Life"* and *"The New Soldiers' Guide,"* as well worth giving or sending to men in our armed services. They slip into a letter easily and both of them bring a heart-warming message of the love and power of Christ. Both may be purchased in quantity from the Good News Publishing Company, 322 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

Defending The Bulwarks

By Rev. Hunter B. Blakely, Jr., D.D., Th.D.
The Knox Press. Price 25c.

A clear and clarion call!

The permanency and expansion of the Christian College should be assured by this book. It reveals the handsome part the Christian College is playing in the premier interest of our Nation; and in the very life of our Church.

This book by Dr. Blakely, who is the President of our Queens College in Charlotte, exposes the hand of God in the Christian College, building fine-fibered men and women for homes where Christ is honored, stabilizing Godly communities by strong Christian leadership and producing seasoned and capable Christian men and women to move into the forefront of all life, professional and commercial.

Besides all this, and of vital interest to us, the Christian College helps assure the future strength and growth of our beloved Church. The dignified and distinguished contribution of the Christian College to the history of education in America leaves the Christian reader with his head up and should garrison his heart for loyal support and fill his hands with generous gifts.

This little book, which can be purchased for 25 cents, should be widely read by our clergy and laymen and may be profitably reviewed by ministers for their people's intelligent co-operation in the "Forward to Victory Campaign" in our Church for its Christian schools and colleges. —S.M.G.

Should 'Give Us Pause'

The following from an English preacher should cause serious thought here in America:

"We have been a pleasure-loving people, dishonoring God's day, picnicking and bathing, and now the seashores are barred.

"We have preferred motor travel to church going, and now there is no fuel for our motors.

"We have ignored the ringing of the church bells, calling us to worship, and now the bells cannot ring except to warn us of invasion.

"We have left our churches half empty on the Lord's day, and now the buildings are in ruins.

"We would not listen to the way of peace, and now we are forced to listen to the way of war.

"The money we would not give to the Lord is now taken from us for taxes.

"The food for which we forgot to say thanks, is now unattainable.

"Nights we would not spend in prayer are now spent in anxious air raids.

"The evils of modernism we would not fight, and now we face the Germany in death struggle, which produced these teachings.

"In view of such results the truth of God's plain words ought to sink into people's hearts all over the world: 'If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their lands.'" (II. Chron. 7:14.)